UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

[Plair	ntiff], <u>Calista</u>	Enterprises Ltd.		
VS.		Plaintiff(s),	Civil No: <u>3:13-cv-01045-SI</u>	
[Defe	endant], <u>Ten</u>	za Trading Ltd. Defendant(s).	JOINT ALTERNATE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REPORT	
	ding ADR ar	\ // I	all cases, unless exempt, are required to confer hundred fifty (150) days of the initiation of a e with LR 16-4(d).	
1.	Have cour ⊠Yes	nsel held settlement discussion □No	ons with their clients and the opposing party?	
	If not, provide an explanation:			
2.	The parties propose: (check one of the following)			
	□ (a)		d to a neutral of their choice for ADR not pursuant to LR 16-4(e)(1).	
	□ (b)	mediator or staff media	tor. (See LR 16-4(f)for Court-sponsored The parties seek a Court mediator because:	

JOINT ALTERNATE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REPORT Revised: January 1, 2011

□ (c)	ADR may be helpful at a later date following completion of:			
□ (d)	The parties believe the court would be of assistance in preparing for ADR by:			
⊠ (e)	The parties do not believe that any form of ADR will assist in the resolution of this case.			
□ (f)	Other:			
ATED: March	By: /s/Matthew Shayefar Plaintiff's Attorney			
	By: /s/Devon Zastrow Newman Defendant's Attorney			